UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/042,658	01/08/2002	Brian Carl Stanz	021756-024600US	6991	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER		
			LERNER, MARTIN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/17/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/042,658	STANZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MARTIN LERNER	2626		

		WATER CERTIFICATION	2020	
The MAILING	DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 13 Oct	ober 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
application, applicant application in condition	must timely file one of the following	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request within one of the following time	
a) The period for repl	y expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
no event, however, Examiner Note: If b	will the statutory period for reply expire labox 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	in the final rejection, whichever is later. In g date of the final rejection. E FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO	
Extensions of time may be obt have been filed is the date for under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calcul set forth in (b) above, if checke	lated from: (1) the expiration date of the s	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orige than three months after the mailing da	136(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as te of the final rejection, even if timely filed,	
	was filed on . A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of	
filing the Notice of Ap		nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a	а
(a) They raise new	dment(s) filed after a final rejection, by issues that would require further consissue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
(c) ☐ They are not de appeal; and/or	eemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re		
	dditional claims without canceling a c (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
	e not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		empliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
	s overcome the following rejection(s):		timely filed amendment canceling the	
non-allowable claim(s	s).		-	
how the new or amer	<u> </u>		Il be entered and an explanation of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EV	<u>√IDENCE</u>			
because applicant fai	evidence filed after a final action, bu iled to provide a showing of good and nted. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		otice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered rit or other evidence is necessary and	
entered because the	evidence filed after the date of filing affidavit or other evidence failed to o sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or othe REQUEST FOR RECONS	er evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.	
	onsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:	
12. Note the attached Ir 13. Other:	nformation <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
		/Martin Lerner/		
		Primary Examiner, Art L	Jnit 2626	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Firstly, Applicants' arguments do not provide any additional clarity for the definiteness of "concurrently". Applicants say that concurrently means "at the same time", but Applicants' Specification does not disclose in what sense translation is concurrent with modification and development of the source text. Applicants' statement that the programmer may also be the translator, or that the programmer and the translator may be working side-by-side with each other, only adds to the confusion because neither of these embodiments is disclosed by the Specification.

Secondly, both Yamamoto et al. and Malcolm ('903) disclose embodiments where translation is concurrent with modification and development of the source code. Yamamoto et al. discloses a development cycle, where a testing phase reveals programming errors, and the software is shipped back for any necessary retranslation. Correction of a programming error must involve some modification of the source code. Thus, source code is modified concurrently with retranslation during a development cycle. Similarly, Malcolm ('903) discloses that changes are common during a typical engineering/software development cycle. A set of screen panels are sent to a translation center before the final code is completed. Here, the final code refers to the source code. Thus, any modification of the source code must be followed by retranslation at the translation center. Both of these instances involve "concurrent" changes to the source code and the translation insofar as the concurrency is measured with respect to both occurring within the development cycle.